

PATENT
Atty. Dkt. No. DIVA/118DIV1
Serial No. 10/690,856
Page 7 of 9

REMARKS

This response is intended as a full and complete response to the non-final Office Action mailed November 30, 2006. Claims 1-33 are pending, of which claims 5-9 and 15-20 are withdrawn from consideration, and claims 1-4, 10-14 and 21-33 are rejected.

In view of the following discussion, Applicants believe that all of the claims are allowable. It is to be understood that Applicants do not acquiesce to the Examiner's characterizations of the art of record or to Applicants' subject matter recited in the pending claims. Further, Applicants are not acquiescing to the Examiner's statements as to the applicability of the art of record to the pending claims by filing the instant response.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 10-14 and 21-33 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Freeman et al. (5,724,091, hereinafter "Freeman"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants submit that, contrary to the Office Action, Freeman's col. 14, line 36 to col. 16, line 1+, does not disclose the features of: "determining shifts needed to be applied to timing information in a second video stream in order to generate recalculated timing information; replacing the timing information in the second video stream with the recalculated timing information; transitioning in an immediate and smooth manner to a second video stream having the same PID value; and serving the second video stream," as recited in claim 1.

Specifically, Freeman teaches a method for synchronous switching between two video streams, by providing a data channel comprising synchronization pulses and a time code to indicate when a memory read pointer should skip from a memory location corresponding to one signal to another location for another signal (col. 15, lines 6-15). In Freeman, the clocks at the transmission and receive ends are synchronized by a time code, and the various video streams are also synchronized with respect to these clocks (col. 15, lines 21-29).

524411-1

PATENT
Atty. Dkt. No. DIVA/118DIV1
Serial No. 10/690,856
Page 8 of 9

Since each individual channel in Freeman is already referenced to a common reference point (col. 15, lines 29-32), there is no need in Freeman to apply any recalculated timing information to a second video stream, as provided in Applicants' invention.

Indeed, the cited portions of Freeman do not teach or suggest features such as determining timing shifts, replacing timing information in the second video stream with recalculated information, or the two video streams having the same PID value.

As such, Freeman fails to teach each and every element of Applicants' invention of claim 1. Thus, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Freeman, and is allowable under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Furthermore, independent claim 10 recites features similar to those of independent claim 1. For at least the same reasons discussed herein with respect to claim 1, Applicants submit that independent claim 10 is also not anticipated by Freeman and, therefore is allowable under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Dependent claims 2-4, 11-14 and 21-33 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 and 10, and recite additional limitations thereof. As such, and for at least the same reasons discussed above, Applicants submit that these dependent claims also are not anticipated by Freeman and are allowable under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. DIVA/118DIV1

Serial No. 10/690,856

Page 9 of 9

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that all claims presently pending in this application are in condition for allowance. If however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Eamon J. Wall at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2/27/07

Eamon J. Wall, Attorney

Reg. No. 39,414

(732) 530-9404

Patterson & Sheridan, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702